



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NOTES ON THE FIRST BOOK OF THE AENEID.

8 quo numine laeso, 181 Anthea si quem iactatum ventis videat. The indefinite adjective in v. 181 is certainly best explained by attributing to it an adverbial force, such as belongs to *nullus* and to temporal adjectives. The variant *qua* gives the meaning; Mr. Page, who points out the incorrectness of the paraphrase *sicubi* (which would make *quem* = local *qua*), himself renders by 'it may be.' But this phrase introduces a notion of alternatives which cannot be expressed by *qua*. The *si quem* of v. 181 is equivalent to the *si forte* of v. 375; in II 81 the adverbial adjective *aliquod* is strengthened by the addition of *forte*. Passages which I have not found cited for this use of the adjective are Ov. M. IX 8 f. and Stat. Th. II 359 f.

Wagner argued for a like value of the interrogative adjective in v. 8. The passages cited by him fall (omitting Catal. 8 (10), 10, where the text is doubtful) into three classes; 1) E. VI 80 f., G. II 271, IV 505, A. II 322, III 337; 2) A. IV 429, VI 466. In these two classes more recent editors generally reject or disregard the interpretation of the pronoun as adverbial, which is in some cases impossible, in the rest at least unnecessary. Then 3) Cic. Rep. I 56. 36, imitabor ergo Aratum qui . . . a Iove incipiendum putat. Quo Iove? aut quid habet illius carminis simile haec oratio? Another example of the same usage is Cic. de Or. I 22. 104, est enim apud M. Pisonem Peripateticus Staseas Quem tu mihi, inquit Mucius, Staseam, quem Peripateticum narras? and in Greek Plat. Rep. I 330 B, πότερον δέ, ἢν δ' ἐγώ, ὦ Κέφαλε, ὧν κέκτησαι τὰ πλείω παρέλαβες ἢ ἐπεκτήσω; ποί' ἐπεκτησάμην, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες; The earmarks of this colloquialism (in Latin perhaps, to judge by the places where it is found, a literary and borrowed colloquialism) are two: the use of a pronoun where we should employ an adverb, and the association of this pronoun with a word repeated after the interlocutor. As the repetition and the colloquial environment are wanting to the Virgilian passage, the parallel is inexact and there is no ground for taking the adjective in other than its proper sense. That *numen* can = *voluntas* has been sufficiently shown by Henry, though some of the passages adduced by him require a different interpretation. Kvíčala objects

(against Weidner) that *numen* signifies "nur das gesammte Willensvermögen", not "eine einzelne Willensäußerung"; it is equally true that *voluntas* leans more to the abstract side than do Eng. "wish" and Ger. "Wunsch". Such expressions as "what's your will", or "ich habe einen Wunsch", would normally be rendered by the Latin verb; it is, therefore, only what we expect to find that Cicero, R. A. 50. 145, *qua in re tuam voluntatem a me laedi putas?*, prefers an adverbial to an adjectival interrogative. But abstract shifts easily to concrete; that a *quam tuam voluntatem* would not have been impossible is shown by Caes. B. C. III 109, *quid esset suae voluntatis*, which is a very good parallel to V. A. II 123, *quae sint ea numina divom*.

148 *ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est seditio*. The use elsewhere of *saepe* after a word of comparison (*qualis* A. V 273, *ceu* ib. X 723, *ut* G. II 279, Cic. Cat. I 13. 31) makes it reasonable to associate the adverb here with *veluti* and to assume that it and the preceding prepositional phrase have exchanged places in their respective clauses—a transposition scarcely more violent than that of *deinde*, v. 195, or that admitted by Ovid in M. IX 707, *neque erat ficti nisi conscia nutrix*. And if in Ter. Hec. 307 we adopt the reading of Dziatzko, *non maxumae sunt maxumas quae interdum iras iniuriae faciunt*, this offers a like example of double transposition (rhetorically, indeed, more effective and eased by the general frequency of the incorporation of the antecedent).—But the comment of Servius, *saepe autem ut fieri solet*, seems to have influenced not only some Virgilian editors, but also Munro in his note on Lucr. V 1231 f., *nequiquam, quoniam violento turbine saepe correptus nilo fertur minus ad vada leti*: "Lucr. does not mean to say 'in vain, since he often perishes none the less'; but what he means is this, 'since in every case a man perishes none the less for all his prayers, as we see by various examples'; *saepe* therefore means *id quod saepe fieri videmus*; though less marked it has essentially the same force in such passages as II 85 and IV 34, where *cum saepe* means *cum ut saepe fit*; III 912 (*hoc etiam faciunt*)¹ *ubi discubere tenentque pocula saepe homines, i. e. ut saepe fit*." But in this last passage the main clause simply straddles the subordinate clauses, and the adverb, belonging rhythmically to *homines* and by signification most naturally to *faciunt*, helps to draw the two together and to make us feel the prime pertinence of the

¹ These words are omitted in Munro's citation.

former as in the first instance subject of the latter. Giussani's comment, "*saepe vale per tutta la scena discritta*", seems to imply that he regards it as belonging to all three verbs; this is syntactically difficult and, like Munro's interpretation, throws the emphasis where it is less needed; the querulousness of men is the essential element, the conviviality is merely incidental. In V 1231 Munro's rendering of *saepe* seems to attribute to Lucretius the exaggerated statement that they who pray must perish; the fact that destruction often follows on a prayer for preservation suffices to prove to the Epicurean the general uselessness of prayer. In IV 34 there is obviously no need for departing from the ordinary interpretation of the adverb; in II 85 the rendering *ut saepe fit* would answer excellently and might be admitted if there were otherwise any evidence, or any syntactical probability, that this or any other adverb could be so paraphrased. But the adverb which modifies the verb may be resolved only into a principal clause (for various forms of such resolution in the case of *saepe* cp. Pl. Most. 108, Ter. Hec. 308, Lucr. I 897); the adverb can be resolved into a subordinate, always a relative, clause only when it stands as attribute to a substantive, as in the examples cited in Kuehner, II p. 165. Here, indeed, it is usually the substantive that, being in apposition, has the value of a relative clause and carries the adverb along with it, as in V. A. I 21, *populum late regem=qui late regeret*; more rarely the adverb alone represents the clause, as in Liv. I 17, 4, *multarum circa civitatum=quae circa erant*. We must then seek for Lucr. II 85 f., *nam cum¹ cita saepe obvia confluxere*, an interpretation which shall not violate the syntax of the adverb. Munro's translation—"For when during motion they have, as often happens, met and clashed"—brings *obvia* into close connection with *confluxere*; the fact that the adjective is often associated with verbs which express the notion of going suggests that we should here connect it with *cita*, which expresses the beginning of going. If we punctuate, *nam cum, cita saepe obvia, confluxere*, we shall have a participle to which will belong the value not of a temporal but of a relative clause, and to which the adjective will stand in a predicative relation; and the participial clause may be paraphrased by *quae saepe ita cita sunt ut obvia essent*, "which often have been so set in motion (are moving on such lines) as to meet."

¹ *Cum* is, of course, a conjecture, but, I believe, universally accepted.

156 curruque volans dat lora secundo. Henry agrees with Servius in explaining *secundo* by *obsequenti*, understanding, however, as object not the impossible Servian *Troianis*, but *Neptuno* or *aurigae*. That the adjective may have this value, is true, but must be demonstrated from other examples than Henry's. The transitive *secundare* of Prop. III (IV) 21. 14 has no place here; it is to be explained from Servius on A. III 36, *secundarent . . . prosperos facerent*. But Tac. A. II 24, *secundante vento*, shows an intransitive *secundare* = *secundum esse*¹; and the adjective shows the metaphorical notion of *obsequium* in Sall. Jug. 14. 19, *omnia secunda et oboedientia sunt*; that we have here a pleonasm, in which the second adjective explains the first, and that *secunda* is not to be rendered by *prospera*, seems to be a natural inference from the context. We have a *re obsequi* in Pl. As. 496, *secunda mihi facis*, a *verbis obsequi* in Sall. Jug. 65. 3 *hominem . . . secunda oratione extollit* ("i. e. quae illius sententiae non adversaretur, sed secundum eam esset, eique adularetur ac blandiretur" Kritz), in Ov. A. A. I 584, *nec dubites illi verba secunda loqui*, and Liv. II 38. 1, *audientes secunda irae verba*; so, too, in Enn. A. 307 M., 194. 14 B., *secunda loquens in tempore*, beside which passage are to be set Ter. Haut. 827, *obsecundato in loco*, and Ad. 994, *haec reprehendere et corrigere me et secundare in loco*. This last seems to be the only passage where the simple verb = *obsequi*, and the form is preserved only by Donatus; the Terentian manuscripts exhibit the more usual *obsecundare*, which spoils the metre. Donatus offers two explanations: *vel in melius convertere vel obsequi*; the second is confirmed by the contrast of *secundare in loco* with v. 990, *quia non iusta iniusta, prorsus omnia omnino obsequor*.

This metaphorical sense is, however, too remote from the context of the Virgilian passage; with *currus* the adjective is most naturally felt to have its primitive sense of motion. So, in fact, most commentators take it; Conington's remark, "the idea in *secundo* is that of easy gliding" expresses the general view.

¹So, at least, according to Lewis and Short, s. v.; but as Tacitus is more given to developing new usages than to retaining old, it is possible that he may employ the verb absolutely on the basis of *secundare iter, aquas* (Ov. Her. 13, 136), or the like. The question cannot easily be determined from the few examples: Draeger says: "*secundante* in derselben Verbindung bei Justin 26. 3. Sonst dichterisch und im Spätlatein"; but the last part of his remark seems to apply only to the better known transitive verb.

The provenance of this signification is commonly explained by regarding *curru secundo* as analogous to *secundo flumine, vento*, and the like. But in those phrases the implied object of the verbal adjective is always the subject of the main action, and the adjective itself denotes not, as Henry says, "seconding you, going in the direction you wish," but simply "following"; V. G. III 447, (aries) *secundo defluit amni* ("drifts down with the stream behind him"), gives the type. To this type *curru volat secundo*, whether *curru* be taken as ablative or as dative, does not conform; neither chariot nor horses follow the driver.¹

It is out of place to cite, as Conington and Forbiger do, the elaborate *vela secunda dare*, which Ovid (A. A. II 64, Fast. III 790) employs in two distinct senses, and with which is to be compared V. A. III 455, *sinus implere secundos*; only a complete departure from the primitive meaning could allow the adjective to be combined with these substantives, and its force is exerted on the complex of verb and substantive, not on the latter alone. On the other hand, Conington's citation of A. VI 146, *namque ipse volens facilisque sequetur*, is, as Forbiger says, apt, and indeed offers the only logical explanation. Gossrau says: "*curru secundo, celeri vel qui facile equos sequitur*"; the second of his alternatives is the right one, for there is no way in which the adjective can gain the meaning "swift" attributed to it by Heyne. The examples given in Lewis and Short of *sequi* denoting an easy yielding to a tractive force, all have, or imply, *manum*, or an equivalent, as object; but another mode of traction is expressed in Ov. Met. IV 54, *lana sua fila sequente*, and is implied, though without a definite suggestion, in the absolute use of the verb, *ibid.* I 647, *si modo verba sequantur* (both passages cited by Henry, but not pertinent to his interpretation). Of course, in this view *curru* must be ablative, as indeed it must be according to any other interpretation of the adjective than that of Servius and Henry.

¹Perhaps an exception to the type occurs in Sall. Jug. 19. 3, *secundo mari prima Cyrene est*. Wirz (Jacobs⁸), indeed, seeks to make this conform by explaining: so dass das Meer mitfolgt, d. h. zur Seite des Reisenden bleibt". It seems to me difficult to assume such a meaning for *sequi*, and easier to believe that Sallust simply did violence to the adjective in aiming at a variation from the normal *secundum mare*. Such a use as that in Caes. B. G. VII 58, *secundo flumine iter facere coepit*, where a march along the bank is meant, may have helped him to the new term, but is not parallel; for Labienus was actually marching down the river.

455 f. *artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem miratur*. Neither Ribbeck's *intrans* nor Peerlkamp's *mirantur* has found general acceptance; and against the reading of cod. Bern. 184 pr. m., *intra se*, there stands such an overwhelming mass of testimony, that Deuticke, not convinced of its correctness, admits it only in default of a better.

For *a. m. inter se* Servius offers the explanation: *hoc est, habebat artificum comparisonem*; Servius Dan. adds: '*inter se*' autem *inter se* certantium, vel aliquid tale. Each of these explanations has found modern adherents, and either is conceivably possible; both lack confirmation by parallel passages. Mr. Page, adopting the former, says: "*Artificum manus inter se similes, dissimiles*, would be ordinary Latin; so would *a. m. inter se mirabiles*, and so why not *a. m. inter se miratur*? For *miratur* put *mirabiles* *putat*, and all is clear". But the expression *inter se mirabiles* is so far from being ordinary that no example of it seems to occur; and while it is not incredible that *inter se* should contain the idea of comparison (which is not contained in *mirror* and its derivatives), this also lacks confirmation by examples. The notion of rivalry, read into the prepositional phrase by Servius Dan., is found in Tac. H. III 29: *acerrimum tertiae septimaeque legionum certamen*; *et dux Antonius cum delectis auxiliariis eodem incubuerat*. *Obstinatos inter se cum sustinere Vitelliani nequirent*, etc. Here the meaning of *inter se* is shown by the preceding *certamen* and by the situation; in the Virgilian passage there is no word pointing to the idea of rivalry, and the situation, while not altogether averse from that idea, does not inevitably provoke it.

A third explanation is that offered by Siebelis (Gymnasial-progr., Hildburghausen, 1845), *artificum manus inter se operantium*, which is essentially the same as those of Kappes and Schrader (quoted by Forbiger) and of Metzger (Philol. XXXV p. 563), who translates by "die arbeiter die einander in die hände arbeiten". In their brief treatment of the matter both Siebelis and Metzger (probably also Schrader, whose view I know only through Forbiger) are open to the criticism passed by Kvíčala on Kappes of having failed sufficiently to consider the nature of the expression *inter se*, which, says Kvíčala, "nur mit einem solchen Substantiv verbunden wird, welches den Begriff der Wechselseitigkeit schon in sich trägt ferner kann man sagen *amor inter se* u. dgl., weil man auch sagt *amare inter se*, aber

laborare inter se ist nicht zulässig, und ebenso wenig *labor inter se* oder etwas ähnliches". This statement, while too sweeping, defines correctly the normal use of the phrase in question, the nature of which, as well as the exceptions to the norm, it is worth while to consider with care.

The combination formed by *inter* with a pronoun that may be understood in a reciprocal sense (*nos, vos, se*) is employed, in the first place with verbs or verbal substantives, the action of which involves two persons, each of whom is necessarily alike agent and "patient": *Seius et Titius inter se contendunt* = *Seius cum Titio et Titius cum Seio contendit*; and the relation remains the same, though less sharply defined, if only one object and one subject are expressed, as in *Seius cum Titio contendit*. It is further employed with words in which such reciprocity, while not inevitably contained, is readily suggested by the nature of the action; the sentence *Seius cum Titio loquitur* may limit speech to Seius and leave Titius a *persona mula*, but it also allows us to infer the exchange of words which is definitely expressed by *Titius et Seius inter se loquuntur*. Finally, in *Seius Titium amat* the action runs only one way and there is no scope for inference; but the current which sets from personal subject to personal object is potentially reflexible, and we thus easily arrive at a *Seius et Titius inter se amant*.

With verbs, the action of which is directed toward no object, or toward one that is not personal, there can be no true interaction; if such verbs are nevertheless sometimes accompanied by *inter se* etc., this seems to be, in the main, because of the intimate relation between *inter* and *cum*. In associating with verbs of the type of *loqui, coire, contendere* the latter preposition, forced beyond its primitive signification of mere accompaniment, comes into close touch with *inter*, which again sometimes follows *cum* back to its own ground. This process yields such forms of expression as the following, distinct exceptions to Kvěčala's rule:

Lucr. II 29, *inter se prostrati* in gramine; *ibid.* 76, *inter se mortales mutua vivunt* (cf. Cic. C. M. 14. 49, *secum esse secumque, ut dicitur, vivere*, where Reid cites Tusc. I 31. 75, Pers. 4. 52); *id.* V 959 f., *neque ullis moribus inter se scibant nec legibus uti* (cf. V. A. II 453, *pervius usus tectorum inter se*, where the verbal substantive *usus* has the value of a passive verb); Cic. Fam. IX 3. 1, *ne nostra nobiscum aut inter nos cessatio vituperetur* (with *nobiscum* cf. Prop. III (IV) 23. 15, *cessabimus una*;

but Cicero does not remain content with the notion of simple companionship, which is all that the verb properly admits); de Or. I 1. 2, ad eas artis celebrandas inter nosque recolendas; Sall. Jug. 41. 2, populus et senatus Romanus placide modesteque inter se rem publicam tractabant¹; V. G. I 301, mutuaque inter se laeti convivia curant; ibid. IV 174 = A. VIII 452, illi inter sese magna vi braccia tollunt.

This last example furnishes direct proof that a *laborare inter se* is not impossible; beside it we may set Iuv. 3. 264, haec inter pueros varie properantur and over against it Ter. Haut. 126 f., pro se quisque sedulo faciebant quo illam mihi lenirent miseriam. As *pro se quisque* expresses individual action, so *inter* (and that, as the Juvenal passage shows, not with a reciprocal pronoun only) expresses joint action. In the following passages the phrase *ipsi inter se*, by a further development, denotes the action of two persons toward each other as contrasted with their common action toward a third person; Liv. I 56. 11, ut (Sextus) ignarus responsi expersque imperii esset, rem summa ope taceri iubent, ipsi inter se, uter prior . . . matri osculum daret, sorti permittunt; Cic. Clu. 43. 122, censores denique ipsi saepe numero superiorum censorum iudiciis . . . non steterunt; atque etiam ipsi inter se censores sua iudicia tanti esse arbitrantur, ut alter alterius iudicium . . . rescindat. Cicero's phrase is the bolder of the two, since the close association of *inter se* with an expressed nominal subject gives it an air of being independent of the verb.

With a substantive not otherwise having verbal force *inter se* occurs in Liv. XL 8, cum vultus inter vos minime fraternos cernerem, where, however, it depends not on the substantive alone but on the complex of substantive and adjective; it is the notion of manner contained in the attribute that imparts to the substan-

¹ Wirz (Jacobs⁸) on Sall. l. c. §5, res p., quae media fuerat, dilacerata, comparing Liv. II 57. 3, dum consules tribunique ad se quisque omnia trahant, nihil relictum esse virium in medio, distractam laceratamque rem p., says: "Das *media fuerat* enthält eine kurze Wiederholung von §2 *placide mod. inter se rem p. tractabant*; die beiden Staatsgewalten hatten früher den Staat als ein gleichsam zwischen ihnen liegendes Gemeingut betrachtet, das weder ganz in den Händen der einen, noch in denen der andern Partei war." But *res media* (= *in medio sita*) is not *res communis*, and it is the latter idea that is required by *tractabant*, which does not correspond to the Livian *ad se trahant* and *distractam*, but to *administrabant*. Kritz interprets rightly: "*Inter se* communionem imperii significat, ita ut et senatus et populus rem p. capesserent." Cf. Liv. IV 56. 12, si quando promiscui honores, communicata res p. esset.

tive the verbal quality, which it acquires in the same manner, and in like connection with a prepositional phrase, in Hor. C. I 2. 39 f., *acer et Mauri peditis cruentum voltus in hostem*. Editors are indeed wont to refer to this passage from C. I 6. 17 f., *proelia virginum sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium*, by way of illustrating the use of *acer in c. acc.*; but the sense clearly demands that *acer Mauri voltus* be regarded as equivalent to *Maurus acriter intuens*. It may, in fact, seem doubtful whether *acer* ever takes the construction thus attributed to it; no other examples than these two appear to be cited, and in C. 6 it is quite possible to connect the preposition with *proelia*, which would easily admit it through its relation to *pugnare*. This interpretation appears to me preferable on account of the closer connection which would thus be effected between *proelia virginum* and the following words; instead of the comparatively simple interlinking in

sectis in-iuvenes unguibus acrium



we should have the more elaborate

proelia virginum sectis in-iuvenes unguibus acrium.



very like in form to C. III 11. 26 f., cited by Professor Smith, *Introd.* § 111 as an example of the manner in which "two groups are sometimes linked together by the connection of their interior words".

The passages which I have cited to illustrate the exceptional use of *inter* have received, so far as I know, little attention from commentators, evidently because of their simplicity; with a verb, or a phrase having verbal quality, the meaning of *inter se* was so easily felt that no one was at the trouble of defining it. That Virgil's lines, on the other hand, stirred up discussion, is due in the first place to the habitually concrete character of *manus*. Even in metaphorical expressions, such as *extremam manum imponere* and *manus afferre*, that substantive retains its primitive value, and is felt as a vivid physical substitute for the abstract *cura* or *vis*; cf. Cic. Off. II 4. 14, where upon the phrase, *sine hominum opera*, there follows the more forcible variation, *sine hominum manu atque opera*. The only passage I have found, in which *manus* loses force, is Quint. X 1. 97, *nitor et summa in excolendis operibus manus magis videri potest temporibus quam ipsis defuisse*. Here it is weakened by the addition of the prepo-

sitional phrase and by its coordination with an abstract, *nitor*, to which it is not related in sense and of which, therefore, it cannot be the concrete expression; the result is that it is reduced to the level of *opera* or *labor* and becomes in effect a verbal substantive. The fact that the word rarely undergoes such a development may be the reason why many commentators on our passage have explained *manus* and *operum laborem* as concrete in sense; so Heyne, Henry, Kappes, Gebhardi, Page. No doubt such a meaning is quite admissible for *manus*, as it is frequent with *labor*; Mr. Page refers to II 306, sternit sata laeta boumque labores, where he cites V 359, artes="works of art", VI 683 manus="exploits"; a very close parallel would be Mart. IV 39. 2 ff., et solus veteres Myronis artes, solus Praxitelis manus Scopaeque solus Mentoreos habes labores. But with this interpretation it is impossible (and here Henry and Kappes are much at fault) to take *inter se* as modifying the substantives; without a verbal notion, expressed or implied, there can be no preposition. It is, therefore, here not *laborem* that is as concrete and nominal as *manus*, but *manus* that, under the influence of *laborem*, becomes verbal and abstract; and for understanding *operum laborem* we must compare not G. II 155, adde tot egregias urbes operumque laborem (i. e. *opera labore exstructa*), but A. I 507 f., operumque laborem partibus aequabat iustis (i. e. *laborem qui in operibus faciendis adhiberetur*). Virgil's expression is complicated, and its sense obscured, by the two genitives; the subjective *artificum* is most easily felt as a possessive with *manus*, the objective *operum* as belonging only to *laborem*, and this tends to draw apart the accusatives, which the poet aimed at blending into a single conception by means of *inter se*. That this phrase was intended to bring together the two substantival groups, Kappes seems rightly to have felt; their fusion is, however, closer than his interpretation would allow, and the dominant element is the last, the distinctly verbal, substantive. As in Quint. I. c., so here *manus* is weakened by the proximity of the preposition; the weakening is less obvious, because the preceding genitive is so easily misunderstood. From what seems to me the correct paraphrase of this tangled sentence I should omit *manus*, or should at most admit it as a subordinate element, an instrumental: *artifices (manibus) inter se in operibus faciendis laborantes miratur*.

737 summo tenuis attingit ore. The modern interpretation of these words seems to be uniformly that of Heyne: "*summo ore*

tenuis, primis labris degustavit". The evident objection to this is that *ore* in the text is made to depend on *tenuis*, while in the paraphrase it is treated as an instrumental with the verb, such as we have in Cic. de Or. I 19, 87, ne primoribus quidem labris attigisset, Cael. 12. 28, qui primoribus labris gustassent . . . et extremis, ut dicitur, digitis attigissent, and N. D. I 8. 20, primis, ut dicitur, labris gustasse. The possible equivalence of *summo ore* to Cicero's *primis labris* is shown by Prop. IV (V) 7. 10, summaque Lethaeus triverat ora liquor, and Sen. Ep. 10. 3, non a summis labris ista venerunt; but there is no parallel for such an expression as *tenuis ore attingere* in the sense here required, nor could there well be, since *tenuis* can apply only to the thing or part touched, not to that which touches. We must, therefore, separate the instrumental *ore*, which belongs with *attigit*, from *summo*, which is here a substantive and sole object of *tenuis*: 'She touched with her mouth as far as the surface'. A pendant which helps to explain is Hor. C. III 15, 16, poti faece tenuis cadi; and the prepositional phrase expresses the same idea as is rendered (in metaphorical relations) by an adverb in Lucr. III 261, summatim attingere, and by an adjective in Nep. Pelop. 1. 1, si tantummodo summas (virtutes) attigero. Such a separation of the two ablatives seems to be implied in the Servian notes: *summo tenuis usque ad labra*. attigit ore et verecundiam reginae ostendit, etc. But Servius Dan. also confuses the point reached with the instrument.